



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

BLENDS: THEIR RELATION TO ENGLISH WORD FORMATION, by Louise Pound, Ph.D., Professor of the English Language, University of Nebraska. Heidelberg, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1914 (Anglistische Forschungen 42). Pp. iv+58.

In this book Miss Pound divides the subject as follows: I. General nature and interest¹ of blend-words. II. Relation to standard or literary speech. III. Some delimitations. IV. Present-day vogue of blend-formations. V. General classes of blends. VI. Illustrative lists of English blends.

It is true, as the author claims, that little interest has been shown in blends. As an instance, Brugmann, in giving the "Motive und Arten der Wortbildungsvorgänge" in his *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik*, does not even mention crossing or amalgamation. And yet the formation of blends is a very important feature in the growth of language. For if the psychological processes that are now going on in language development have always been active, then every language has in it a large number of blends, most of them parading as thoroughbreds, because they are the offspring of an ancient union.

After reading Miss Pound's interesting monograph, one is still in doubt as to what blends really are. For "blend-words, amalgams, or fusions, may be defined as two or more words, often of cognate sense, telescoped as it were into one; as factitious conflation which retain, for a while at least, the suggestive power of their various elements." Later it is admitted that "it cannot always be assumed that the original blend was conscious or intentional." The probabilities are that most of the blends that have added materially to the increasing stock of words were made with only a subconscious association of the words combined.

Blends may be divided into three classes: 1. Words that have taken on or lost a sound or combination of sounds on account of synonymous words or by folk-etymology. 2. Words or compounds in which a part is supplanted by another word or part of a word, as: *baffound* 'perplex, bewilder' from *baffle* and *confound*; *dink* 'deck, dress' from *deck* and *prink*. 3. Haplologic blends, i. e., compounds in which one of two similar sounds falls out. These may be overlapping compounds, as: *idolatry*, *tragicomedy*, *pantaloontic*, or Shaw's *Potsdamnation*; grafted compounds, as: *fibbercator* from *fibber* and *fabricator*, *screwomatics* from *screws* 'rheu-

¹Under this head Miss P. states that "blend-words have never been treated separately, i. e., for their own sake, at much length." My article of thirty-four pages giving 246 groups of blends: Kontaminationsbildungen und haplologische Mischformen, *JEGPH.*, July 1912, had escaped her notice.

matics' and *rheumatics*; or compounds with (syllabic) dissimilation as: *howtowie* 'a young hen that has never laid' from *howdie* and *towie* id., *peedoddle* 'dawdle' from *peedle* 'do anything in a slow, indolent fashion' and *doddle* 'dawdle', *rantacket* 'noise, uproar' from *rant* 'a rough frolic, noise' and *racket*, etc.

Of course, the above classes might be subdivided according to use or origin, as in Miss Pound's classification. But in a scientific classification it is immaterial whether a blend is the effulgence of a literary light or the obscuration of a clodhopper, the 'versiflage' of the satirist or the 'slanguage' of the street, the 'sweedle' of the advertizer or the 'snangle' of the child, however interesting it may be to know these facts.

Though most of the blends given in the lists are transparent enough, some are quite the contrary, and might be differently explained. Such words as *chump*, *lunch*, *smoggy*, *blash*, *blurt*, *flounder*, *flurry*, *flush*, *squush*, *squish*, *swizzle*, *thump*, *thwack*, *whang* are more than doubtful. Some of them may be very old, though putting them into antiquity doesn't make them any the less blends. Some may be rime-words. In English occur many parallel forms with *k* or *ch* and *p*, as: *bunch*: *bump*; *chunk*: *chump*; *hunk*, *hunch*: *hump*; *lunch*, *lunk*(head): *lump*; *crouch*: *creep*; *prink*: *primp*; *flick*: *flip*; *nick*, *snick*: *nip*, *snip*; *suck*: *sup*, etc. Rime-words also may be the following: *bang*, *twang*, *whang*, *ding*, *ring*; *bump*, *dump*, *flump*, *plump*, *thump*; *clack*, *crack*, *thwack*, *whack*; *clash*, *crash*, *dash*, *lash*, *plash*, *splash*, *smash*, *thrash*; *blash*, *flash*, *flush*; *blurt*, *spurt*, *flirt*, *jert*; *flurry*, *hurry*, *scurry*; *quirl*, *swirl*, *twirl*, *whirl*, and many others. In a sense even these might be called blends. But if so, then every word that has assumed an additional element, whether determinative, formans, or suffix, is a blend.

Others are formed by secondary ablaut. Thus *squish*: *squash*: *squush* are analogous to *plish*: *plash*: *plosh*; *swish*: *swash*; *mish* (in *mish-mash*): *mash*: *mush*; *click*: *clack*: *cluck*; *clink*: *clank*: *clunk*, etc. Similarly *flounder* may be a secondary ablaut-form to dial. *flinder* 'flirt, run about in a fluttering manner', Flem. *flenderen* 'wander about lazily or sluggishly', Bav. *fländern*, *flandern* 'hin und her bewegen, wehen, ziehen'.

In the lists are also included words that may be regular derivatives. Thus *straddle*, which may go back to OE. **stræðlan*, does not owe its meaning in any degree to *saddle*. Germ. *strīdan* means 'stretch out (the legs) forward or sidewise' (cf. *Mod. Phil.* IV, 497 f.). *Burble* 'bubble, gush', which is given as a creation of Carroll, is locally in use now, and has come down from ME. *burblen*. It is related to Pruss. *burbeln* 'klunkernd tönen, trinken, saufen', MDu. *borbelen* 'aufsprudeln', French dial. *borbouller*, Span. *borbollar* 'bubble'. *Broodle* 'cuddle and soothe a little child' need not be regarded as influenced by *cuddle* and *soothe*. It may well be only a frequentative of *brood* after the analogy of *cuddle*, *muzzle*, *snoodle*, *snuggle*, etc. This is a favorite formation of one of my friends, who

says: *bobble*, *chinkle*, *flapple*, *muffle* 'fumble', *snortle*, *whopple*, etc. *Swizzle* 'guzzle, imbibe noisily or rapidly' may be from dial. *swiz* 'a whizzing noise; force, impetus'. For meaning compare *swipe* 'strike with a long or wide sweeping blow: drink off hastily', *swipple* 'tipple'; *nozzle* 'strike violently: drink with avidity'. *Smoggy* may contain an original *g* as in *smudge*, EFris. *smügen* 'nebeln, nassen, fein und andauernd regnen'. *Mux*, which I also earlier explained as a blend of *mix* and *muss* (*Mod. Phil.* IX, 175), is perhaps rather from dial. *mux* 'dirt, filth', OE. *meox*, modified in meaning by *mix*. Compare also *mixter-maxter* 'heterogeneous mixture' and *muxter-maxter* 'a confused heap' (*ibid.* 161). *Quag* 'a shaking, marshy soil, quagmire' is explained in *Cent. Dict.* as an abbreviation of *quagmire*. In any case there is no reason to assume a telescoping of *quake* and *bog*. The word is sufficiently authenticated in *quaggy* 'trembling under the foot, as soft wet earth, boggy, spongy', *quaggle* 'a tremulous motion'. Whether the word was originally a blend or a rime-word it is impossible to say. Beside *quake*, OE. *cwacian* occur *quaver* (: *quiver*), *quab*, *quob* 'shake, tremble, quiver', sb. 'bog, quagmire', Norw. *kvabb*, *kvap* 'weiche Masse', MLG. *quabbe*, *quabbel* 'Bebemoor', WFlem. *kwabbel* 'a lump which, because of the moisture it contains, easily trembles or quivers'. *You* (*jū* not *jau*) can not be a blend of *ye* and *thou*. *You* regularly represents ME. *ȝeu*, *ȝēw*, with *ȝ* from the nom. But OE. *ēow* (ME. **ēw*) would also give NE. *jū*. Compare OE. *ēow*, *īw* 'yew', ME. *ēw*, NE. *yew*.

Several words should be omitted from the list, as they are extensions by suffixed endings rather than blends. So Miss Pound herself excludes *judgmatical*, *splendiferous*, *grandiferous*, etc. By the same token drop the following: *Belkuppung* (why two p's?). 'hickuping' is formed from *belk*, *belch* with the ending *-up²* as in *hickup* (*hiccup*) from *hick* 'make a clicking sound in the throat, hickup'; *jiccups* 'hickups': *jick* id.; *snickup* 'hickups': *snick* 'a sudden, sharp noise, click'. *Dastardice* is formed from *dastard* with the suffix *-ice* as in *cowardice*, not a blend of that word. *Shuttance* 'riddance' is from *shut* in the expression *get shut of* 'get rid of' + the suf. *-ance*. *Riddance* as well as *shuttance* is a hybrid, but not a blend. *Scare some* is not "from *fearsome*, or *timmersome*, + *scare*," but from *scare* + the suf. *-some* as in *fearsome*, *timmersome*. So we might form *awesome*. With greater propriety *timmersome* or rather *timorsome* might be regarded as a blend, since it is made over from *timorous*. *Clacket* 'clack, chatter' may be an older word than *rocket*. The suf. *-et* is OE. *-ettan*, Goth. *-atjan*. Even *embranglement* 'embroilment, confusion' is not properly a blend but a hybrid like *entanglement*.

Like the above are compounds with parts of words that are abstracted as suffixes, as: *gasalier*, *electrolier* (: *chandelier*); *beero-cracy*, *bureaucracy*, *cottonocracy*, *mobocracy*. Here *-(o)cracy* has its

²On this ending see *Hesperia*, *Ergänz.* I, 52-72.

regular meaning 'rule, power', just as it does in *aristocracy*, *democracy*, *plutocracy*, *theocracy*. In *cablegram*, *gram* is used simply for 'message', abstracted from *telegram*. So also *-ology* is abstracted in the sense of 'science', and may even be used alone, or may form such mongrels as *bug-ology*, *bird-ology*, etc.

Finally words like *Wafrika*, *Westralia* are not properly blends but elliptical contractions. They did not result from crossing of two words nor from any wearing down and welding together of two forms (hence not agglutination), but from the intentional omission of a part of the word so as to make a shorter form.

But these criticisms do not mean that the book is not worth while. It is decidedly so, all the more because there are still those who refuse to believe. They see them, hear them, and use them, and yet, with the farmer at the circus, they declare: "There isn't any such animal."

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

University of Chicago.

BERTRAND, J.—J. A. CERVANTES ET LE ROMANTISME ALLEMAND. Paris, Felix Allan, 1914. (VIII, 635 S.)

Das grösste Verdienst der Romantiker um die Entwicklung der deutschen Literatur besteht ohne Zweifel nicht so sehr in ihrem eignen, dichterischen Schaffen, als vielmehr in ihren kritischen Schriften und in der Eroberung fremder Gebiete für das deutsche Geistesleben. Es war der Drang nach Universalität, der ihnen hier die Wege wies, während ihre Weltanschauung die Auswahl und Bewertung fremdländischer Dichter und ihrer Werke bestimmte. Von all den Dichterfürsten, welche die Romantiker so zu sagen entdeckten und auf den Schild erhoben, stand wohl keiner als Mensch und Künstler ihrem eignen Geistesleben näher als Cervantes. So kann es kaum wunder nehmen, dass dieser Dichter einerseits einen grossen Einfluss auf die Kunstübung und ästhetische Theorie der Romantiker ausübte, und dass anderseits die Bewertung Cervantes' und seiner Werke ganz auf dem Urteile der Romantiker fusst und eigentlich nie darüber hinausgelangt ist. Selbst den erklärten Gegnern der Romantik gelingt es nur selten sich aus diesem Abhängigkeitsverhältnis zu retten.

Bertrand verfolgt in seiner Monographie mit Gewissenhaftigkeit und Gründlichkeit den wechselnden Anteil, den man seit dem Ende des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts in Deutschland für Cervantes und seine Werke gezeigt hat. Das Interesse an der spanischen Literatur, welches im siebzehnten Jahrhundert in Deutschland geherrscht, war zu Anfang des achtzehnten fast vollständig erloschen, und die Meisterwerke der spanischen Literatur waren eigentlich nur in den unvollkommenen, französischen Uebersetzungen bekannt und zugänglich. Einen entscheidenden Anstoss zu erneuerter Beschäftigung mit der fremdländischen Literatur im allgemeinen, und der